| 1  |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |
| 5  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 6  | DISTRICT OF NEVADA   |  |
| 7  |  |  |
| 8  | PATRICK HICKMAN,   | Case No.: 2:18-cv-00404-GMN-NJK                  |
| 9  | Plaintiff(s),  | Order  |
| 10 | v.   | (Docket No. 40)                                  |
| 11 | KENNETH MEAD, et al.,  |  |
| 12 |  |  |
| 13 | Defendant(s).  |  |
| 14 | Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed amended scheduling order. Docket   |  |
| 15 | No. 40. The parties ask the Court to extend various discovery deadlines by 90 days. Docket No.   |  |
| 16 | 40. Local Rule IA 6-1(a) requires that the parties state the reasons for the extension requested and   |  |
| 17 | inform the Court of all previous extensions of the subject deadline the Court granted. The parties   |  |
| 18 | fail to abide by this rule. <i>Id</i> . Further, the parties fail to show good cause why an extension should   |  |
| 19 | be granted. <sup>2</sup> See Local Rule 26-4. Accordingly, the parties' request to extend discovery deadlines  |  |
| 20 | is hereby <b>DENIED</b> .  |  |
| 21 | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |  |
| 22 | Dated: October 16, 2018  |  |
| 23 |  |  |
| 24 |  | NANCY J. KOPPE<br>United States Magistrate Judge |
| 25 | The parties improperly filed an amended proposed discovery plan and scheduling order.  The parties appear to be aware of the proper method of asking for an extension, as they did so previously. Docket No. 15. Nonetheless, the Court construes this document as a stipulation to extend time. See Local Pulo 14.6.1 |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |
| 28 | <sup>2</sup> The parties also fail to include the other  | requirements of Local Rule 26-4.                 |